BEFORE THE STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

NANCY KEENAN

STATE OF MONTANA

TRUSTEES, WHEATLAND COUNTY SCHOOL
DISTRICT NO. 16, (HARLOWTON)

Appellant,

Vs.

OSPI 178-89

LYLE (BUD) COLBY AND CARLA HINAND,

Respondents.

STATEMENT OF CASE

In the spring of 1988, Lyle Colby accepted a contract with Wheatland County School District No. 16 (Harlowton) (hereinafter referred to as "the District") for the 1988-89 school year as a tenured physical education teacher at a salary of \$10,373.40. In an amendment to the contract, dated August 10, 1988, the District agreed to pay Mr. Colby an additional \$3,060.00 for performing the duties of head girls' and boys' basketball coach. At a special meeting held on March 28, 1988, the Trustees of the District voted to renew Colby's teaching contract for 1989-1990. The Board decided not to renew Colby's contract as head basketball coach. Mr. Colby contends that as a tenured teacher, Section 20-4-203(1), MCA, requires that he be "reelected from year to year

. . as a tenure teacher at the same salary and in the same or

1

2

3

4

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

comparable position of employment as that provided by the last executed contract with the teacher" unless he is terminated in accordance with the provisions of 20-4-204, MCA. The District offered him a tenured teacher contract for 1989-90 with a salary The salary offer did not include an amount of \$15,300.00. equivalent to the stipends he had received as head girls' basketball coach and as head boys' basketball coach under his 1988-89 amended contract.

Mr. Colby appealed the final decision of the Board of Trustees to the Wheatland County Superintendent of Schools on June 27, 1989. The issue on appeal was stated as follows:

> When teachers are employed as tenured teachers amendments to their contracts with curricular duties specific extra accompanying stipends may a school district terminate the extra-duty stipends without complying with the requirements of section 20-4-204, MCA.

County Superintendent rendered of Findings The Conclusions of Law and an Order on August 8, 1989. In her Order, the County Superintendent sent the matter back to the parties to be resolved at level one of the grievance procedure set forth in the collective bargaining agreement between the parties. parties met after entry of the Order and agreed that it was not possible to address the issues in a grievance procedure at that point. The District appealed the decision of the County Superintendent to the State Superintendent in accordance with Section 20-3-210, MCA.

On February 6, 1990, prior to oral argument the St Superintendent received a letter from Carla Hinand dated Febru 3, 1990, stating her decision to withdraw as a party to the appear to the oral argument, counsel for Hinand informed the St Superintendent of her client's decision to withdraw as a party the proceeding. No objection was raised by the District.

DECISION AND ORDER

Having reviewed the record, read the briefs of the par and heard oral argument, this Superintendent now makes following decision: The decision and order of the Co Superintendent is effected by error of law. The S Superintendent hereby reverses Conclusions of Law numbers 8, and 16.

The appeal was properly before the County Superintend CL#2.

The amended contract between Colby and the District prove that he would receive \$10,373.40 as a tenured physical educateacher and \$3060.00 stipend for coaching the girls' and be basketball team for the 1988-1989 school term. Section 203(1), MCA, protects the salary of the tenured teacher. Section 20-1-101(18), MCA, defines the word "teacher" and that definite does not include a coach. Section 20-4-203(1) specifically gittenure to "teachers" and refers to the "last executed contract the teacher." A tenured teacher has a statutory right to contemployment as a tenured teacher. A coach under contract to

5 6

7

9

10

8

11 12

13

14 15

1617

18 19

21

20

2223

24

25

district must rely on the terms of the employment contract for any expectation of continued employment with the District. Mr. Colby's contract with the District as a coach expired at the end of the 1988-89 school term.

Therefore, the order of the County Superintendent is hereby vacated and the decision of the District is hereby affirmed.

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Standard of Review

The standards for review by the State Superintendent are set forth in 10.6.125, ARM. This rule was modeled upon Section 2-4-704, MCA, and the Montana Supreme Court has interpreted the statute and the rule to mean that agency (County Superintendent) findings of fact are subject to a clearly erroneous standard of review and that conclusions of law are subject to an abuse of discretion standard of review. Harris v. Bauer, Mont. ____, 749 P.2d 1068, 1071, 45 St. Rptr. 147, 151, (1988). Further, the petitioner for review bears the burden of showing that they have been prejudiced by a clearly erroneous ruling. Terry v. Board of Regents, 220 Mont. 214, 217, 714 P.2d 151, 153 (1986). Findings are binding and not "clearly erroneous" if supported by "substantial credible evidence in the record." This has been further clarified to mean that a finding is clearly erroneous if a "review of the record leaves the court with the definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been committed."

On appeal, the State Superintendent "may reverse or modify

the decision if substantial rights of the appellant have been prejudiced."

Discussion

The County Superintendent having jurisdiction of the appeal was obligated to decide the issues properly before her.

Lyle Colby had an amended contract with the District for the 1988-1989 school term. The contract required that Colby perform services in two different capacities. First, he was contracted as a tenured physical education teacher. Second, he was contracted as the head basketball coach for both boys' and girls' teams. The County Superintendent correctly concluded that coaches do not achieve tenure under 20-4-203(1), MCA. A school district cannot extend the legislative cloak of tenure to coaching positions by including coaching duties in a tenured teacher's contract with the district.

Mr. Colby's reliance on <u>Sorlie v. School District No. 2</u>, 205 Mont. 22, 667 P.2d 400, 12 Ed. Law Rptr. 1283, is misplaced.

The Supreme Court held that Sorlie was a tenured administrator under 20-4-203(1), MCA. The position she held required that she be a certified "teacher" as defined in 20-1-101(18), MCA.

A position as coach does not require that the incumbent have a teaching certificate. Section 20-4-203(1), MCA, requires that a district pay a tenured teacher the same salary in the same or a comparable position of employment as that provided by the last executed contract with the teacher. The word "teacher" as used in

20-4-203(1), MCA is defined in 20-1-101(18), MCA. The language of 20-4-203(1), MCA, when read as a whole applies to contracts between "teachers" and districts. The fact that one document contains terms providing for services from one person both as a "teacher" and as a coach is not enough to extend salary protection to the amount paid the individual for the coaching services.

DATED THIS ____ day of June, 1990.

NANCY KEENAN

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

THIS IS TO CERTIFY that on the 5° day of June, 1990, a true and exact copy of the foregoing <u>DECISION AND ORDER</u> was mailed, postage prepaid, to the following:

Chadwick H. Smith SMITH LAW FIRM, P.C. 26 West Sixth Avenue Helena, MT 59624

Emilie Loring HILLEY & LORING, P.C. 500 Daly Avenue Missoula, MT 59801

Linda V. Brandon
Paralegal Assistant